

**RECEIVED**  
**CENTRAL FAX CENTER****JUL 20 2007**Attorney Docket No.: 40101/09901  
Ref. No.: WR2000.003div**REMARKS****I. INTRODUCTION**

Claims 23-27 have been withdrawn from consideration. Claim 1 has been amended. Thus, claims 1-11 are pending in the present application. In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims are allowable.

**II. OBJECTION TO THE DRAWINGS**

The drawings stand objected to because the view numbers do not comply with 37 C.F.R. § 1.84(u)(1). (See 4/20/07 Office Action, p. 2.) In view of the amendments to the drawings, it is respectfully submitted that this objection should be withdrawn.

**III. OBJECTION TO THE SPECIFICATION**

The Specification stands objected to because the parent application information in the first paragraph is not up to date. (See 4/20/07 Office Action, p. 3.) In view of the amendment to the Specification, it is respectfully submitted that this objection should be withdrawn.

**IV. CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 101**

Claims 1-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as directed to non-statutory subject matter. (See 4/20/07 Office Action, p. 3.) Specifically, the Examiner asserts that, given the broadest reasonable interpretation, the “memory space” of claim 1 may be a virtual space, and that under such an interpretation, every claimed element of claim 1 is directed to a data structure per se. (See *id.*, citing MPEP § 2106.)

Attorney Docket No.: 40101/09901  
Ref. No.: WR2000.003div

**In the Drawings:**

Please replace all drawing sheets with the replacement sheets annexed hereto.

Attorney Docket No.: 40101/09901  
Ref. No.: WR2000.003div

Claim 1 has been amended to recite “a display for displaying an output of the software module to a user.” Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 now recites statutory subject matter, and that this rejection should be withdrawn. Because claims 2-11 depend from, and, therefore, include all of the limitations of claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are also allowable.

**V. CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 1-8 and 10-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Applicant’s admitted prior art (hereinafter “AAPA”). (See 4/20/07 Office Action, citing Specification, pp. 2-4; Fig. 1.)

AAPA describes a method by which user tasks may access resources controlled by the operating system. To do so, a user task must execute a system call, which causes the processor to execute a “trap” routine that makes a function call to the desired operating system resources. The user task “cannot directly access the instructions and data structures in the system space it wishes to access, but rather must employ a special access procedure.” (Specification, p. 2, ll. 25-26.) This access procedure requires another task to be created by the operating system in the system space in order to perform the requested action. This procedure increases system-processing overhead and execution time. (See Specification, p. 2, ll. 14-31.)

In contrast, claim 1 recites “a computer system, comprising: a memory space having a number of memory locations; an operating system located within a system space, the system space corresponding to a first subset of the memory locations of the memory space; a software module located within a user space, the user space corresponding to a second subset of the number of memory locations of the memory space; a plurality of operating system data structures located in the system space; a system page located within the system space and corresponding to a portion of the first subset of the number of memory locations, the system page including a subset of the plurality of operating system data structures; and a function located within the

Attorney Docket No.: 40101/09901  
Ref. No.: WR2000.003div

software module; *wherein the function may not be linked to the first subset of the number of memory locations except for the subset of the plurality of operating system data structures.*"

Applicant respectfully submits that the recitation of claim 1 is clearly distinguishable from the disclosure of AAPA. AAPA describes a process by which any user task may access system resources, but must "employ a special access procedure" in order to do so. (See id.) Claim 1 recites "wherein the function may not be linked to the first subset of the number of memory locations except for the subset of the plurality of operating system data structures." In other words, a function located within a software module located within the user space *may not* be linked to the system space (e.g. the first subset of the number of memory locations), other than a predefined subset of the operating system data structures (i.e. the system page), which may be accessed *without* initiation of an additional process as required by AAPA. (See, e.g., Specification, p. 8, l. 25 – p. 9, l. 9; p. 11, l. 19 – p. 12, l. 7.) Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that AAPA does not disclose "wherein the function may not be linked to the first subset of the number of memory locations except for the subset of the plurality of operating system data structures," as recited in claim 1.

The Examiner also cites U.S. Patent No. 5,893,166 to Frank et al. (hereinafter "Frank") to demonstrate that system pages were known in the art at the time of the invention. (See 4/20/07 Office Action, p. 5.) However, Applicant submits that Frank also does not disclose "wherein the function may not be linked to the first subset of the number of memory locations except for the subset of the plurality of operating system data structures," as recited in claim 1. Therefore, AAPA and Frank, in combination, neither disclose nor suggest the recitation of claim 1. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn. Because claims 2-11 depend from, and, therefore, include all of the limitations of claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are also allowable for at least the reasons stated above.

**RECEIVED**  
**CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

**JUL 20 2007**


Attorney Docket No.: 40101/09901  
Ref. No.: WR2000.003div

**CONCLUSION**

It is therefore respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable. All issues raised by the Examiner having been addressed, an early and favorable action on the merits is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 20, 2007

By:   
Michael J. Marcin (Reg. No. 48,198)

Fay Kaplun & Marcin, LLP  
150 Broadway, Suite 702  
New York, New York 10038  
Tel.: (212) 619-6000  
Fax: (212) 619-0276